

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1, 3, 5-10 and 15-19 are pending. Claims 1, 5-7, 9-10, 15, and 18-19, which are independent, are hereby amended. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed, and specifically at pages 25-28.

No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Changes to the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 5-7, 9, 10, 15, 18, and 19, which were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite are amended herein, obviating the rejection.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 3, 5, and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,898,762 to Ellis, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Ellis") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,978,649 to Kahn (hereinafter, merely "Kahn"), and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2005/0262542 to DeWeese, et al. (hereinafter, merely "DeWeese")

Claims 7-10, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,072,983 to Klosterman (hereinafter, merely “Klosterman”) in view of Kahn and further in view of DeWeese.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“...wherein the verifying whether or not said program selected by said selecting means is a program of a channel that is receivable, comprises **checking whether the selected channel is already set as a channel of reception and then comparing a user set territory of residence to a broadcast territory where the user is residing, and then verifying whether or not the selected channel is receivable based on the checking and comparing steps...**” (Emphasis Added)

As understood by Applicants, Ellis relates to providing a client-server interactive television program guide system that is implemented on user television equipment. The interactive television program guide provides users with an opportunity to define expressions that are processed by the program guide server.

As understood by Applicants, Klosterman relates to providing a scheme for margin television schedule information received from multiple sources. In the preferred embodiment, a microprocessor mixes and sorts the schedule information received from multiple source devices. The schedule information is then displayed in a television schedule guide.

As understood by Applicants, Kahn relates to transmitting a communication signal to a plurality of receiver units, each receiver unit having associated therewith respective authorization information identifying subsets of the communication signal the receiver unit is authorized to process.

As understood by Applicants, Deweese relates to providing a television chat system that allows television viewers to engage in real-time communications in chat groups with other television viewers while watching television.

Applicants submit that nothing has been found in Ellis, Klosterman, Kahn, or DeWeese, taken alone or in combination, that would teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 1. Specifically, Applicants submit that Ellis, Klosterman, Kahn, and DeWeese fail to teach or suggest that the verifying whether or not said program selected by said selecting means is a program of a channel that is receivable, comprises **checking whether the selected channel is already set as a channel** of reception and then comparing a user set territory of residence to a broadcast territory where the user is residing, and then verifying whether or not the selected channel is receivable based on the checking and comparing steps, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, claim 1 is patentable.

For reason similar to those recited above, claims 5-7, 9-10, 15, and 18-19 are also patentable.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION


In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the references providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are in condition for allowance and request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
William S. Frommer
Reg. No. 25, 206
(212) 588-0800